

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress
2nd Session

Vote No. 174

June 25, 1998, 10:44 a.m.
Page S-7046 Temp. Record

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION/Authority to Close Bases

SUBJECT: National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1999 . . . S. 2057. Inhofe amendment No. 2981.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 48-45

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 2057, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1999, will authorize \$270.6 billion in budget authority for national defense programs (this amount is equal to the requested level, and is in accordance with the budget agreement of last year). In real terms, spending will be \$2.9 billion less than last year. As a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP), defense spending will be just 3.1 percent, which will be the lowest level of defense spending since 1940. Defense spending has declined steadily since 1986, when it was 6.5 percent of GDP.

The Inhofe amendment would tighten existing restrictions on the executive branch unilaterally closing or realigning military bases. Specifically, the Administration: would need congressional approval before it could close a military installation with 225 or more civilian employees (the current-law threshold is 300 civilian employees); would need congressional approval before it could realign a military installation if that installation had 750 or more civilian employees and the realignment would result in a reduction of 40 percent or more of those employees (the current-law thresholds are 1,000 employees and 50 percent); would have to wait 4 years before closing a base after a realignment if that realignment lowered the number of civilian employees it had to below 225 (this provision would prevent the Administration from twisting the law on congressional approval by realigning a base to get it under the threshold for acting unilaterally and then closing it). The amendment would also amend the legal definition for “closure” to make clear that it included “any action to inactivate or abandon a military installation or to transfer a military installation to caretaker status.”

Those favoring the amendment contended:

This amendment is necessary to ensure that the base-closing process proceeds rationally and to prevent the Clinton

(See other side)

YEAS (48)			NAYS (45)		NOT VOTING (7)	
Republicans (31 or 60%)	Democrats (17 or 41%)		Republicans (21 or 40%)	Democrats (24 or 59%)	Republicans (3)	Democrats (4)
Abraham	Hatch	Boxer	Ashcroft	Biden	Hutchinson- ⁴	Akaka- ²
Allard	Helms	Breaux	Chafee	Bingaman	Roth- ²	Baucus- ²
Bennett	Hutchison	Cleland	Coats	Bryan	Specter- ³	Glenn- ²
Bond	Inhofe	Conrad	Cochran	Bumpers		Rockefeller- ²
Brownback	Kempthorne	Daschle	DeWine	Byrd		
Burns	Lott	Dodd	Enzi	Feingold		
Campbell	Mack	Dorgan	Gramm	Feinstein		
Collins	McConnell	Durbin	Grams	Harkin		
Coverdell	Nickles	Ford	Grassley	Hollings		
Craig	Roberts	Graham	Gregg	Inouye		
D'Amato	Sessions	Landrieu	Jeffords	Johnson		
Domenici	Shelby	Lautenberg	Kyl	Kennedy		
Faircloth	Smith, Bob	Mikulski	Lugar	Kerrey		
Frist	Snowe	Moseley-Braun	McCain	Kerry		
Gorton	Thomas	Murray	Murkowski	Kohl		
Hagel		Sarbanes	Santorum	Leahy		
		Torricelli	Smith, Gordon	Levin		
			Stevens	Lieberman		
			Thompson	Moynihan		
			Thurmond	Reed		
			Warner	Reid		
				Robb		
				Wellstone		
				Wyden		

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Administration from proceeding unilaterally. Many of us are also intent on stopping President Clinton from further politicizing that